UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,401	09/23/2003	Gerald Altman	5957-72402	9364

35690   7590   04/28/2011
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.
P.O. BOX 398
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398

EXAMINER
LOVEL, KIMBERLY M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2167	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/28/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent_docketing@intprop.com
ptomhkkg@gmail.com

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _21 February 2011_.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _24-30,33,35,36,41-45,48-54,56-63,65-72 and 76-79_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _24-30, 33, 35, 36, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72 and 76-79_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This Communication is in response to the Amendment filed 21 February 2011.

2.   Claims 24-30, 33, 35, 36, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72 and 76-79 are currently

pending. In the Amendment filed 21 February 2011, none of the claims are amended.

This action is made Final.

3.   The rejections of claims 24-30, 33, 35-36, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72 and 76-79

as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,427,032 to Irons et al in view of US Patent

5,557,512 to Vanko et al in view of US Patent No 5,615,367 to Bennett et al have been

maintained.

Claim Objections

4.   Claims 24, 41, 48, 56 and 66-68 objected to because of the following

informalities:

Referring to **claim 24**, the claim utilizes the phrase "is usable to" in line 12.

Referring to **claim 41**, the claim utilizes the phrase "is usable to" in line 16 and

the phrase "is retrievable from" in line 23.

Referring to **claim 48**, the claim utilizes the phrase "is usable to" in line 16.

Referring to **claim 56**, the claim utilizes the phrase "is usable to" in line 15.

Referring to **claim 66**, the claim utilizes the phrase "is retrievable from" in line 3.

Referring to **claim 67**, the claim utilizes the phrase "is retrievable from" in line 1.

Referring to **claim 68**, the claim utilizes the phrase "is retrievable by" in line 3.

It has been held that the recitation that an element is "*able* to" perform a function

is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not

constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. *In re Hutchison*, 69 USPQ 138.

Therefore, it is suggested that the phrases "usable to" and "retrievable from(by)" be

changed to "used to" and "retrieved from (by)."

Appropriate correction is required.

35 USC § 101 - Clarifications

5.   It is noted that the claimed computer readable memory medium is considered to

be represented by the disclosed computer and therefore is considered to be limited to

statutory embodiments which meet the requirements under 35 USC 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7.   **Claims 24-30, 33, 35-36, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72 and 76-79 are rejected**

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 6,427,032 to

Irons et al (hereafter Irons) in view of US Patent 5,557,512 to Vanko et al (hereafter

Vanko) in view of US Patent No 5,615,367 to Bennett et al (hereafter Bennett).

Referring to claim 24, Irons discloses a method, comprising:

receiving a succession of electronic documents into a computer document

management system, wherein each of the succession of electronic documents is

received at a corresponding point in time [scanning or imaging the documents] (see

column 7, lines 52-67); and

for each of at least a subset of the received electronic documents:

the computer system generating a corresponding unique identifier

[globally unique identifier] (see column 8, lines 30-64 and column 15, lines 24-

48); and

the computer system storing, a respective plurality of attributes relating to

the electronic document [meta-data] in each of a plurality of tables [indexes – the

multiple indexes are considered to represent a plurality of tables] accessible to

the computer system, wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes the

generated unique identifier [unique global identifier] as one of its respective

plurality of attributes, and wherein the generated unique identifier is usable to

access each of the plurality of tables [the globally unique document identifier is

used to effectively link the document image to the record in the database,

facilitating later retrieval of the document image, typically via the indexes], and

wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes a first attribute containing

information indicating a location of a physical document corresponding to the

electronic document (see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and

column 23, lines 39-41); and

the computer system accessing the plurality of attributes [meta-data] for

the electronic document in at least one of the plurality of tables using the

corresponding unique identifier [globally unique identifier] for the electronic

document (see column 6, lines 42-58 and column 8, lines 30-49).

While Irons discloses assigning a globally unique identifier to the documents,

Irons fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the computer system wherein

unique time-based identifier identifies a date and time of day corresponding to the point

in time at which the electronic document was received by the computer system. Vanko

discloses an electronic system for data entry (see abstract), including the further

limitation of the computer system generating a corresponding unique time-based

identifier identifying a date and time of day that the electronic document was received

by the computer system [the file name, recorded on May the third, 1994, at 3:09 pm,

would be 940503.150] (see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier representing the time a

document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as the global identifier of

Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be

anything that identifies the document and a time-based identifier provides a unique

identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the document.

The combination of Irons and Vanko (hereafter Irons/Vanko) fails to explicitly

disclose that the database is a relational database. Bennett discloses the management

of data, including the further limitation of the use of a relational database (see column 8,

line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67; and column 10, lines 14-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize a relational database of Bennett as the storage mechanism of

Irons/Vanko. One would have been motivated to do so since a relational database is an

SQL compatible database and according to Irons, the repository may be a SQL

compatible database (see column 11, lines 45-59).

Referring to claim 25, the combination of Irons/Vanko and Bennett (hereafter Irons/Vanko/Bennett) discloses the method of claim 24, wherein, for a given electronic document received by the computer system: a first of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to an entity originating the given electronic document; and a second of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the location of a physical document corresponding to the given electronic document (Irons: see column 6, lines 25-58 and Bennett: column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67; and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 26, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 25, wherein a date and time of day at which a given electronic documents is received by the computer system corresponds to a date and time of day at which the first electronic document was created by imaging a physical document [the moment the OUTPUT button was activated] (Vanko: see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5 and Irons: see column 8, lines 30-64 and column 15, lines 24-48).

Referring to claim 27, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 26, further comprising the computer system retrieving a given electronic document in the succession of electronic documents from the electronic storage using the corresponding unique time-based identifier for the given electronic document; and wherein the time of day is specified by at least an hour value, a minutes value, and a seconds value (Vanko: see column 15, line 50 – column 16, line 5).

Referring to claim 28, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 24, wherein said receiving includes: receiving imaged electronic documents (Irons: see

column 7, lines 58-61); and/or receiving computer generated electronic documents

(Irons: see column 7, lines 62-64).

Referring to claim 29, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 28,

wherein the imaged electronic documents include electronic documents that were

created by imaging corresponding physical documents, wherein each corresponding

physical document is marked with the corresponding unique time-based identifier after

said imaging [prints and applies a label directly onto the paper-based document] (Irons:

see column 13, lines 1-16).

Referring to claim 30, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 28,

wherein the computer generated electronic documents include electronic documents

received from one or more of the following sources: word processing programs,

graphics programs, e-mail, facsimile transmissions [e-mail] (Irons: see column 7, lines

52-67).

Referring to claim 33, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 24,

further comprising: accessing a first electronic document stored in the storage system

using a first unique time-based identifier, wherein the first unique time-based identifier

corresponds to a first date and point in time of day when the first electronic document

was received into the document management system [the file name, recorded on May

the third, 1994, at 3:09 pm, would be 940503.150] (Irons: see column 7, lines 34-51;

column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41 and Vanko: see column 15, line 56 –

column 16, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier representing the time a document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as the global identifier of Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be anything that identifies the document and a time-based identifier provides a unique identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the document.

Referring to claim 35, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 25, wherein: a third of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to a task associated with the given electronic document; and a fourth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the physical document that corresponds to the given electronic document, wherein an attribute in the fourth table includes a type of physical document (Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67 and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 36, Irons/Vanko/Bennet discloses the method of claim 35, wherein a fifth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a unique value for the given document, wherein the unique value is formed by a combination of a value of a first key of the first table and a value of a second key of the second table (Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11, column 9, lines 48-67 and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 41, Irons discloses a document management system, comprising:

an input unit [document input mechanism 110] configured to receive a succession of electronic documents into a computer document management system,

wherein each of the succession of electronic documents is received at a corresponding

point in time [scanning or imaging the documents] (see column 7, lines 52-67); and

a storage subsystem [item 130] coupled to the input unit and configured to store

the succession of electronic documents in an electronic storage using corresponding

unique identifiers (see Fig 1 and column 6, lines 42-67);

a computer system [item 200] coupled to both the input unit [item 110] and the

storage subsystem [item 130] (see Fig 1 and column 6, lines 59-67), wherein the

computer system is configured, for each of at least a subset of the received electronic

documents, to:

generate a unique identifier [globally unique identifier] (see column 8, lines

30-64 and column 15, lines 24-48); and

use the unique identifier to store the electronic document in the storage

subsystem (see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23,

lines 39-41);

store, a respective plurality of attributes relating to the electronic document

[meta-data] in each of a plurality of tables [indexes – the multiple indexes are

considered to represent a plurality of tables], wherein at least one of the plurality

of tables includes the unique identifier [unique global identifier] for the electronic

document as one of its respective attributes, wherein the generated unique

identifier is usable to access each of the plurality of tables [the globally unique

document identifier is used to effectively link the document image to the record in

the database, facilitating later retrieval of the document image, typically via the

indexes], and wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes a first

attribute containing information indicating a location of a physical document

corresponding to the electronic document (see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8,

lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41); and

access the plurality of attributes [meta-data] for the electronic document in

at least one of the plurality of tables using the corresponding unique identifier

[globally unique identifier] for the electronic document (see column 6, lines 42-58

and column 8, lines 30-49); and

wherein the succession of electronic documents is retrievable from the

electronic storage using unique time-based identifiers [the globally unique

document identifier is used to effectively link the document image to the record in

the database, facilitating later retrieval of the document image, typically via the

indexes] (see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines

39-41).

While Irons discloses assigning a globally unique identifier to the documents,

Irons fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the computer system wherein the

unique identifier is time based. Vanko discloses an electronic system for data entry

(see abstract), including the further limitation wherein the unique identifier is time based

[the file name, recorded on May the third, 1994, at 3:09 pm, would be 940503.150] (see

column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier representing the time a

document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as the global identifier of

Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be

anything that identifies the document and a time-based identifier provides a unique

identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the document.

The combination of Irons and Vanko (hereafter Irons/Vanko) fails to explicitly

disclose that the database is a relational database. Bennett discloses the management

of data, including the further limitation of the use of a relational database (see column 8,

line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67; and column 10, lines 14-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize a relational database of Bennett as the storage mechanism of

Irons/Vanko. One would have been motivated to do so since a relational database is an

SQL compatible database and according to Irons, the repository may be a SQL

compatible database (see column 11, lines 45-59).

Referring to claim 42, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 41, wherein the input unit is configured to receive a first

electronic document at a first point in time corresponding to a first date and a first time

of day within the first date, wherein the computer system is configured to generate a

unique time-based identifier for the first electronic document that corresponds to the first

date and the first time of day [the file name, recorded on May the third, 1994, at 3:09

pm, would be 940503.150] (Irons: see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and

column 23, lines 39-41 and Vanko: see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier representing the time a

document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as the global identifier of

Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be

anything that identifies the document and a time-based identifier provides a unique

identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the document.

Referring to claim 43, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 41, wherein, for a given electronic document received by

the input unit: a first of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes

relating to an entity originating the given electronic document; and a second of the

plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the location of

a physical document corresponding to the given electronic document (Irons: see column

6, lines 25-58 and Bennett: column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67;

and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 44, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 42, wherein: a third of the plurality of tables is configured

to store a plurality of attributes relating to a task associated with the given electronic

document; and a fourth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of

attributes relating to the physical document that corresponds to the given electronic

document, wherein an attribute in the fourth table includes a type of physical document;

a fifth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a unique value for the given

document, wherein the unique value is formed by a combination of a value of a first key

of the first table and a value of a second key of the second table (Bennett: see column

8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67 and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 45, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 42, wherein the first electronic document originated from

an electronic document provided as input to the document management system (Irons:

see column 7, lines 58-64).

Referring to claim 48, Irons discloses a method, comprising:

first means [document input mechanism 110] for receiving a succession of

electronic documents into a document management system, wherein each of the

succession of electronic documents is received at a corresponding point in time

[scanning or imaging the documents] (see column 7, lines 52-67); and

second means for generating a corresponding unique identifier [globally unique

identifier] for each of at least a subset of the received electronic documents, wherein the

second means is coupled to the first means (see column 8, lines 30-64; column 15,

lines 24-48; and Fig 1); and

third means [image storage mechanism 130] for storing each of at least a subset

of the received the electronic documents using the corresponding unique identifiers,

wherein the third means is coupled to the second means (see Fig 1 and column 6, lines

42-67)

wherein the third means is configured to store, for each of the at least a

subset of the received electronic documents, a respective plurality of attributes

relating to the electronic document [meta-data] in each of a plurality of tables

[indexes – the multiple indexes are considered to represent a plurality of tables],

wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes the generated unique

identifier [unique global identifier] as one of its respective plurality of attributes,

wherein the generated unique identifier is usable to access each of the plurality

of tables [the globally unique document identifier is used to effectively link the

document image to the record in the database, facilitating later retrieval of the

document image, typically via the indexes], and wherein at least one of the

plurality of tables includes a first attribute containing information indicating a

location of a physical document corresponding to the electronic document (see

column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41); and

fourth means for accessing, for a given one of the succession of electronic

documents, the respective plurality of attributes [meta-data] for the given document in at

least one of the plurality of tables using the corresponding unique identifier [globally

unique identifier] for the electronic document (see column 6, lines 42-58 and column 8,

lines 30-49).

While Irons discloses assigning a globally unique identifier to the documents,

Irons fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the unique identifier is time-

based and corresponds to a point in time at which the electronic document was

received. Vanko discloses an electronic system for data entry (see abstract), including

the further limitation wherein the unique identifier is time-based and corresponds to a

point in time at which the electronic document was received [the file name, recorded on

May the third, 1994, at 3:09 pm, would be 940503.150] (see column 15, line 56 –

column 16, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier representing the time a

document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as the global identifier of

Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be

anything that identifies the document and a time-based identifier provides a unique

identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the document.

The combination of Irons and Vanko (hereafter Irons/Vanko) fails to explicitly

disclose that the database is a relational database. Bennett discloses the management

of data, including the further limitation of the use of a relational database (see column 8,

line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67; and column 10, lines 14-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to utilize a relational database of Bennett as the storage mechanism of

Irons/Vanko. One would have been motivated to do so since a relational database is an

SQL compatible database and according to Irons, the repository may be a SQL

compatible database (see column 11, lines 45-59).

Referring to claim 49, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management of claim 48, wherein a unique time-based identifier for a given one of the

succession of electronic documents corresponds to a date and time of day within that

date that the given electronic documents was received into the document management

system [the moment the OUTPUT button was activated] (Vanko: see column 15, line 56

– column 16, line 5 and Irons: see column 8, lines 30-64 and column 15, lines 24-48).

Referring to claim 50, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 48, wherein the succession of electronic documents

includes one or more documents, each of which is converted from a corresponding first

physical document [paper-based document] (Irons: see column 7, lines 58-64 and

column 13, lines 1-16).

Referring to claim 51, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 48, wherein the succession of electronic documents

includes one or more documents, each of which corresponds to an electronic document

provided as input to the document management system (Irons: see column 7, lines 58-

64).

Referring to claim 52, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 48, wherein, for a given one of the succession of

electronic documents: a first of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of

attributes relating to an entity originating the given electronic document; and a second of

the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the location

of a physical document corresponding to the given electronic document (Irons: see

column 6, lines 25-58 and Bennett: column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9,

lines 48-67; and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 53, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 52, wherein: a third of the plurality of tables is configured

to store a plurality of attributes relating to a task associated with the given electronic

document; and a fourth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of

attributes relating to the physical document that corresponds to the given electronic

document, wherein an attribute in the fourth table includes a type of physical document

(Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67 and column

10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 54, Irons/Vanko/Bennet discloses the document

management system of claim 53, wherein a fifth of the plurality of tables is configured to

store a unique value for the given document, wherein the unique value is formed by a

combination of a value of a first key of the first table and a value of a second key of the

second table (Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11, column 9, lines 48-67

and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 56, Irons discloses a tangible computer readable memory

medium have instructions stored thereon that are executable by a computing device to

cause the computing device to:

receive a succession of electronic documents into a computer document

management system, wherein each of the succession of electronic documents is

received at a corresponding point in time [scanning or imaging the documents] (see

column 7, lines 52-67); and

generate a unique identifier [globally unique identifier] for each of at least a

subset of the received electronic documents (see column 8, lines 30-64 and column 15,

lines 24-48); and

store, in an electronic storage, and for at least one of at least the subset of the

received electronic documents, a respective plurality of attributes relating to the at least

one electronic document [meta-data] in each of a plurality of tables [indexes – the

multiple indexes are considered to represent a plurality of tables] accessible to the

computer device, wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes as one of its

respective plurality of attributes the unique identifier [unique global identifier]

corresponding to the at least one electronic document, wherein the generated unique

identifier is usable to access each of the plurality of tables [the globally unique

document identifier is used to effectively link the document image to the record in the

database, facilitating later retrieval of the document image, typically via the indexes],

and wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes a first attribute containing

information indicating a location of a physical document corresponding to the electronic

document (see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-

41); and

access the plurality of attributes [meta-data] for the at least one of the received

electronics document in at least one of the plurality of tables using the corresponding

unique identifier [globally unique identifier] for the electronic document (see column 6,

lines 42-58 and column 8, lines 30-49).

While Irons discloses assigning a globally unique identifier to the documents,

Irons fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the unique time-based

identifier corresponds to the point in time at which the electronic document was

received. Vanko discloses an electronic system for data entry (see abstract), including

the further limitation wherein the unique time-based identifier corresponds to the point in time at which the electronic document was received [the file name, recorded on May the third, 1994, at 3:09 pm, would be 940503.150] (see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier representing the time a document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as the global identifier of Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be anything that identifies the document and a time-based identifier provides a unique identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the document.

The combination of Irons and Vanko (hereafter Irons/Vanko) fails to explicitly disclose that the database is a relational database. Bennett discloses the management of data, including the further limitation of the use of a relational database (see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67; and column 10, lines 14-23).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize a relational database of Bennett as the storage mechanism of Irons/Vanko. One would have been motivated to do so since a relational database is an SQL compatible database and according to Irons, the repository may be a SQL compatible database (see column 11, lines 45-59).

Referring to claim 57, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the tangible computer readable memory medium of claim 56, wherein a unique time-based identifier for a first electronic document corresponds to a first-date and time of day at which the first

electronic document was received into the document management system [the moment

the OUTPUT button was activated] (Vanko: see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5

and Irons: see column 8, lines 30-64 and column 15, lines 24-48).

Referring to claim 58, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the tangible computer

readable memory medium of claim 57, wherein the first electronic document

corresponds to a first physical document [paper-based document] converted into the

first electronic document (Irons: see column 7, lines 58-64 and column 13, lines 1-16).

Referring to claim 59, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the tangible computer

readable memory medium of claim 57, wherein the first electronic document originated

from an electronic document provided as input to the document management system

(Irons: see column 7, lines 58-64).

Referring to claim 60, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the tangible computer

readable memory medium of claim 57, wherein the first time of day is specified by at

least an hour value, a minutes value, and a seconds value (Vanko: see column 15, line

50 – column 16, line 5).

Referring to claim 61, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the tangible computer

readable memory medium of claim 56, wherein, for a given one of the succession of

electronic documents: a first of the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of

attributes relating to an entity originating the given electronic document; and a second of

the plurality of tables is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the location

of a physical document corresponding to the given electronic document (Irons: see

column 6, lines 25-58 and Bennett: column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9,

lines 48-67; and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 62, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the tangible computer

readable memory medium of claim 61, wherein: a third of the plurality of tables is

configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to a task associated with the given

electronic document; and a fourth of the plurality of tables is configured to store a

plurality of attributes relating to the physical document that corresponds to the given

electronic document, wherein an attribute in the fourth table includes a type of physical

document (Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11; column 9, lines 48-67

and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 63, Irons/Vanko/Bennet discloses the tangible computer

readable memory medium of claim 62, wherein a fifth of the plurality of tables is

configured to store a unique value for the given document, wherein the unique value is

formed by a combination of a value of a first key of the first table and a value of a

second key of the second table (Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11,

column 9, lines 48-67 and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 65, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 24,

wherein the received electronic documents include imaged electronic documents (Irons:

see column 7, lines 58-61).

Referring to claim 66, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 41, wherein the succession of electronic documents

includes imaged electronic documents (Irons: see column 7, lines 58-61), and wherein

a given one of the succession of electronic documents is retrievable from the electronic

storage by presenting its unique time-based identifier to the electronic storage (Vanko:

see column 15, line 56 – column 16, line 5).

Referring to claim 67, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document

management system of claim 48, wherein the succession of electronic documents

includes imaged electronic documents (Irons: see column 7, lines 58-61); and wherein

a given stored electronic document is retrievable from the third means by presenting its

unique time-based identifier to the third means (Vanko: see column 15, line 56 – column

16, line 5).

Referring to claim 68, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the tangible computer

memory of claim 56, wherein the succession of electronic documents includes imaged

electronic documents (Irons: see column 7, lines 58-61), and wherein a given electronic

document stored in the storage system is retrievable by presenting its unique time-

based identifier to the electronic storage (Vanko: see column 15, line 56 – column 16,

line 5).

Referring to claim 69, Irons/Vanko/Bennet discloses the method of claim 36,

wherein for each of at least a subset of the received electronic documents, the fifth table

includes: at least an attribute indicating a physical type of the corresponding physical

document for the electronic document; and an attribute indicating an input type

associated with a method of creation for that electronic document (Bennett: see column

8, line 65 – column 9, line 11, column 9, lines 48-67 and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 70, Irons/Vanko/Bennet discloses the document

management system of claim 44, wherein the computer system is further configured to,

for each of the at least a subset of the received electronic documents, store in the fifth

table a first attribute and a second attribute; wherein the first indicates a physical type of

the corresponding physical document; and wherein the second attribute indicates an

input type associated with a method of creation for that electronic document (Bennett:

see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11, column 9, lines 48-67 and column 10, lines

14-23).

Referring to claim 71, Irons/Vanko/Bennet discloses the document

management system of claim 54, wherein the fifth table is configured to store, for each

of at least a subset of the received electronic documents: a first attribute indicating a

physical type of the corresponding physical document for the electronic document; and

a second attribute indicating an input type associated with a method of creation for that

electronic document (Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11, column 9, lines

48-67 and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 72, Irons/Vanko/Bennet discloses the computer readable

memory medium of claim 63, wherein the fifth table is configured to store for each of at

least a subset of the received electronic documents: a first attribute indicating a physical

type of the corresponding physical document for the electronic document; and a second

attribute indicating an input type associated with a method of creation for that electronic

document (Bennett: see column 8, line 65 – column 9, line 11, column 9, lines 48-67

and column 10, lines 14-23).

Referring to claim 76, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the method of claim 24, wherein a first of the plurality of tables includes the unique time-based identifier as an attribute, and wherein the first table is accessible using the unique time-based identifier as a primary key of the first table (Irons: see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41 and Bennett: see column 9, line 48-67).

Referring to claim 77, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document management system of claim 24, wherein a first of the plurality of tables includes the unique time-based identifier as an attribute, and wherein the first table is accessible using the unique time-based identifier as a primary key of the first table (Irons: see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41 and Bennett: see column 9, line 48-67).

Referring to claim 78, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the document management system of claim 48, wherein a first of the plurality of tables includes the unique time-based identifier as an attribute, and wherein the first table is accessible using the unique time-based identifier as a primary key of the first table (Irons: see column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41 and Bennett: see column 9, line 48-67).

Referring to claim 79, Irons/Vanko/Bennett discloses the tangible computer readable memory medium of claim 56, wherein a first of the plurality of tables includes the unique time-based identifier as an attribute, and wherein the first table is accessible using the unique time-based identifier as a primary key of the first table (Irons: see

column 7, lines 34-51; column 8, lines 30-64 and column 23, lines 39-41 and Bennett:

see column 9, line 48-67).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments filed on pages 2-6 of the Remarks with regards to the prior

art rejections of the claims have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

        Referring to Applicant's argument on page 2 of the Remarks, the Applicant states

"Applicants respectfully submits that the proposed combination fails to teach or suggest,

as recited in claim 24, 'receiving a succession of electronic documents into a computer

system, wherein each of the succession of electronic documents is received at a

corresponding point in time' and 'for each of the at least subset of the received

documents,' 'the computer system generating a corresponding unique time-based

identifier identifying a date and time of day that the electronic document was received

by the computer system.'"

        The examiner respectfully disagrees that the combination of Irons, Vanko and

Bennet fails to teach the claimed limitations. Irons discloses receiving a succession of

electronic documents into a computer document management system, wherein each of

the succession of electronic documents is received at a corresponding point in time

[scanning or imaging the documents] (see column 7, lines 52-67) and for each of at

least a subset of the received electronic documents generating a corresponding unique

identifier [globally unique identifier] (see column 8, lines 30-64 and column 15, lines 24-

48). While Irons discloses assigning a globally unique identifier to the documents, Irons

fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the computer system wherein unique

time-based identifier identifies a date and time of day corresponding to the point in time

at which the electronic document was received by the computer system. Vanko

discloses generating a corresponding unique time-based identifier identifying a date and

time of day that the electronic document was received by the computer system [the file

name, recorded on May the third, 1994, at 3:09 pm, would be 940503.150] (see column

15, line 56 – column 16, line 5). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

the art at the time of the invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier

representing the time a document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as

the global identifier of Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the

identifier of Irons can be anything that identifies the document and a time-based

identifier provides a unique identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the

document.

Referring to Applicant's arguments on pages 4 and 5 of the arguments, the

Applicant states that "even assuming a motivation to combine Irons and Vanko exists, a

person having ordinary skill in the art would not have applied Vanko's file-naming

scheme to the "unique document identifier" of Iron's system" and "no motivation exists

to combine Irons and Vanko in the manner suggested."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Both Vanko and Irons are in the field of

endeavor of data entry. Both Irons and Vanko disclose assigning a unique identifier to a

document. The difference between Irons and Vanko is the naming scheme utilized to

generate the unique identifier. The concept of generating a unique identifier for a

document is well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for the purposes of data entry. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the concept of a unique time-based identifier representing the time a document is scanned into the system as disclosed by Vanko as the global identifier of Irons. One would have been motivated to do so since the identifier of Irons can be anything that identifies the document and a time-based identifier provides a unique identifier, which also supplies additional meta-data about the document.

The Applicant further argues on pages 5-6 of the Remarks that Bennet does not remedy the defects of Irons and Vanko. For the reasons stated above, Irons and Vanko teach the limitation of "generating a corresponding unique time-based identifier indentifying a date and a time of day that the electronic document was received by the computer system." Therefore, the rejection of the claims in view of Irons, Vanko and Bennet are maintained.

Referring to Applicant's arguments on page 6 of the Remarks with regards to claims 27 and 60, Applicants argue that Vanko fails to teach a "seconds value" and while Vanko does mention a "number of seconds," this quantity is not part of the file name.

The examiner respectfully disagrees that Vanko fails to disclose the claimed limitation. Column 15, lines 56-58 of Vanko state that "The first recording is assigned a file name that reflect the date and time at the moment the OUTPUT button was activated." While column 15, lines 58 – column 16, line 5 give an example of a possible

filename, this is merely an example, and Vanko fails to state that this is the only

mechanism in which to represent the time component. Column 15, lines 50-55 depict

the possible format of a timestamp, which includes a two-digit hour value, a two-digit

minutes value and a two-digit seconds value that the system is able to utilize. Since the

system has the capability of detecting these values, it would have been obvious to one

of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize these values in the naming

scheme of the file to reflect the time at the moment the OUTPUT button was activated.

Therefore, the rejections of claims 24-30, 33, 35, 36, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72

and 76-79 are maintained.

Conclusion

9.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Kimberly Lovel
Examiner
Art Unit 2167

/Kimberly Lovel/
Examiner, Art Unit 2167